accordingly and NABARD did the same for Regional Rural Banks and Cooperative Banks

NABARD has already reimbursed Rs. 9.92 crore towards the interest waived by 14 Regional Rural Banks (RRBs) in the State of Andhra Pradesh under the scheme announced by the Government of India. As regards Cooperatives, the State Government of Andhra Pradesh had its own scheme to waive of 100% interest on Kharif 2002 crop loans, provided the farmers repay the principal. Since the scheme envisaged repayment of principal, the Cooperative Banks had not extended term loan conversion facility to the farmers and hence were not eligible for reimbursement of even the first year deferred interest liability waived by them.

Malpractices by drug companies

2146 SHRI ABU ASIM AZMI. Will the Minister of COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state·

(a) whether it is a fact that MRTP Commission received a number of complaints about malpractices by drug companies;

(b) if so, the details of complaints/issues raised during the last three years;

(c) what are the names of drug companies involved in each case and stage of action taken; and

(d) by when the complaints will be disposed off?

THE MINISTER OF COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c) A Statement is attached. (*See* below).

(d) The MRTP Commission is a quasi-judicial body as such, a time frame for disposal of remaining cases cannot be set.

Statement

The names of drug companies involved in restrictive and unfair trade practices, issues raised and stages of action taken in each case for the last three years

Sl. No.	Case No.	Title	Issues raised	Stage of action
1.	RTPE 30/2001	DG(I&R) Vs. Bio Ved Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd.	Restrictive clauses in the agreement between the Respondent and the other Retailers	Disposed of on 06 07 2001
2.	RTPE 33/2001	DG(I&R) Vs. Bio Ved Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd.	Restrictive clauses in the agreement between the Respondent and the other Retailers.	Disposed of on 05 07 2001
3.	RTPE 39/2001	DG(I&R) Vs. Bio Ved Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd.	Restrictive clauses in the agreement between the Respondent and the other Retailers	Disposed of on 16 05 2001
4.	RTPE 83/2001	DG(I&R) Vs. Ranbaxy Labs Ltd. and Anr.	Restrictive clauses in the agreement between the Respondent and the other Retailers	For consideration of rejoinder of Applicant on 18 11.2004
5.	RTPE 84/2001	DG(I&R) Vs. Ranbaxy Labs Ltd. and Anr.	Restrictive clauses in the agreement between the Respondent and the other Retailers	For consideration of rejoinder of Applicant on 18 11 2004
6.	RTPE 85/2001	DG(I&R) Vs. Ranbaxy Labs Ltd. and Anr.	Restrictive clauses in the agreement between the Respondent and the other Retailers.	For consideration of rejoinder of Applicant on 18 11.2004
7.	RTPE 86/2001	DG (I&R) Vs. Ranbaxy Labs Ltd. and Anr.	Restrictive clauses in the agreement between the Respondent and the other Retailers	For consideration of rejoinder of Applicant on 18.11 2004

Sl No	Case No	Title	Issues raised	Stage of action
8	UTPE 62/2001	Smithkline Beechem Vs Paras Pharmaceuticals Ltd	Disparaging of the product of Applicant by Respondent.	Disposed of on 23.04 2002
9	UTPE 88/2002	V K Sharma Vs Thermax Lab Pharmaceuticals Ltd	Misleading advertisements	Disposed of on 03 07 2002
10	RTPE 13/2002	Sun Pharma, Vadodara Vs Optica Pharmaceuticals, Jagadhari	Disparaging of the Product of Applicant by Respondent	For consideration of rejoinder of Applicant on 01.09 2004
11	RTPE 60/2002	Kripa Medicare Vs Glaxo Smithkline Pharmaceuticals	Stoppage of supply of medicines	Withdrawn on 08 08 2003
12	RTPE 28/2003	Bindal Medicine Traders Vs Glaxo Smithkline Pharmaceuticals	Restrictive clauses in the agreements.	Disposed of on 12.08 2004

Reduction of interest on earthquake loan

2147 SHRI LEKHRAJ BACHANI: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state

(a) whether the Government of Gujarat has made repeated requests for favourable terms for the loans received from the World Bank and Asian Development Bank for earthquake rehabilitation work,

(b) if so, the Central Government's decision on reducing the interest burden of the earthquake loans which was a calamity of grave magnitude; and

(c) whether the overall policy framework for loans for major disaster reconstruction is proposed to be re-examined?